

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2 and 8 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Malik (U.S. Patent No. 7,444,382, hereafter "Malik" ) in view of Sharpe (U.S. Patent No. 6,700,591, hereafter "Sharpe").

As discussed in the June 30, 2008 Amendment, according to exemplary embodiments of the present disclosure, when a user wants to send an e-mail message including an image object F1 as an attachment to a reception terminal, a composite file F2 is generated by adding the e-mail transmission information, such as the sender's address and the recipient's address, to the image object F1. Instead of sending the message with the image object F1 as an attachment to the reception terminal, the message is sent with the composite file F2 to the reception terminal. Thus, the composite file F2 is searchable by transmission information.

The above features of the disclosure are broadly encompassed in claim 2, which recites, *inter alia*, a transmission information setting portion for setting transmission information for sending a message that is intended to include the first file as an attachment to a recipient; a file generation portion for generating a second file by adding the transmission information to the first file; a transmission portion for sending a message that includes the generated second file as an attachment to the

recipient, and a display setting portion for setting whether or not the transmission information is displayed, wherein the file generation portion generates the second file by setting a font used for displaying the transmission information to transparent when the display setting portion sets that the transmission information is not displayed.

The above-recited features of claim 2 are not taught or suggested by Malik or Sharpe, whether considered individually or in combination.

Malik relates to storage management of e-mail messages that contain common attachment files. In Malik, when an e-mail server receives an e-mail message with an attachment file, the header file and the attachment file are stored separately. Col. 4, lines 50-65. When a second e-mail message with an attachment file is received by the e-mail server, a duplication checker determines whether the attachment of the second e-mail message is previously stored. If so, a link is created between the header file of the second e-mail message and the previously stored attachment file. Col. 5, lines 43-61.

In Malik, even though an attachment file can be stored separately from the header file of the e-mail message, the stored attachment file is not a composite file that includes transmission information of the e-mail message. For example, if the e-mail message is deleted, even though a copy of the attachment file might still exist in a data storage, such copy of the attachment file is not searchable based on the transmission information of the e-mail message because no transmission information of the e-mail message is included in the attachment file. In contrast, claim 2 recites a file generation portion for generating a second file by adding the transmission information to the first file, and a transmission portion for sending a message that includes the generated second file as an attachment to the recipient. Therefore,

Malik fails to teach or suggest a combination according to claim 2 that includes the file generation portion and the transmission portion.

Sharpe does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Malik. Neither does the Examiner contend that Sharpe remedies such deficiencies of Malik.

Sharpe is relied upon for allegedly teaching a display setting portion for setting whether or not the transmission information is displayed, wherein the file generation portion generates the second file by setting a font used for displaying the transmission information to transparent when the display setting portion sets that the transmission information is not displayed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sharpe discloses a method of using different font colors to indicate the age of e-mail messages or files. Specifically, the date and time of such e-mail messages or files are analyzed to determine the relative "age" of the item. The item is then displayed in a colored font, where the selected color reflects the relative age of the item. Col. 10, lines 21-22. For example, e-mail messages are displayed in different degrees of red, where bright red indicates a new e-mail message, and a darker red indicates an older e-mail message. Col. 10, lines 22-29.

Sharpe at most discloses using different font colors to indicate the age of e-mail messages or files. Sharpe has no disclosure of a display setting portion for setting whether or not the transmission information is displayed. In addition, Sharpe has no disclosure of setting a font used for displaying the transmission information to transparent when the display setting portion sets that the transmission information is not displayed. Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Sharpe fails to teach or suggest a display setting portion for setting whether or not the transmission information is displayed, wherein the file generation portion generates the second file

by setting a font used for displaying the transmission information to transparent when the display setting portion sets that the transmission information is not displayed, as recited in claim 2.

At least for the above reasons, claim 2 is patentable. Claim 8 is patentable for reasons similar to those for claim 2 because claim 8 includes distinguishing features that are similar to those of claim 2.

### **CONCLUSION**

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested and such action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of present application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,  
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 19, 2009

By: Weiwei Stiltner  
Weiwei Stiltner  
Registration No. 62979

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620